

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-36 were pending in the application at the time the present Office Action was mailed. Independent claims 1, 18 and 24 have been amended to clarify certain aspects of these claims. No claims have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-36 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1-36 were rejected in the present Office Action. More specifically, the status of the claims in light of the Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claims 1-3, 18, 9, 15, 16, 21, 22, 24 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,396,924 to Suso et al. ("Suso");

(B) Claims 4-7, 18-20, 23, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,033 to Campo ("Campo");

(C) Claims 10-14, 17 and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,302 to Harrison ("Harrison"); and

(D) Claims 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,759 to Kobayashi ("Kobayashi").

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in telephone conferences on July 13, 22, and 27, 2004, to discuss the present Office Action. During the course of the conferences, the undersigned attorney and the Examiner discussed possible amendments to the pending independent claims that would further distinguish the claims over the applied references. The following remarks summarize the results of the telephone conferences and reflect the agreements reached. For example, the following remarks reflect the agreement that the applied references, either alone or in combination, cannot support a proper Section 102 or

Section 103 rejection of pending independent claims 1, 18 and 24 as presently amended.

Response to the Section 102 and Section 103 Rejections of the Pending Claims

Pending independent claims 1, 18 and 24 were variously rejected under Sections 102 and 103 in view of Suso, Campo, Harrison, and Kobayashi. In addition to these references, the Examiner also brought U.S. Patent No. 6,658,272 to Lenchik et al. ("Lenchik") and U.S. Patent No. 6,658,268 to Bodnar et al. ("Bodnar") to the attention of the applicant as possible Section 102(e) references.

Without commenting on or conceding the merits of the claim rejections, the applicant has elected to amend pending independent claims 1, 18 and 24 to clarify that (1) the universal joint accommodates rotation of the first device (e.g., the information input/output device) about two axes relative to the second device (e.g., the wireless communication device), and that (2) the universal joint allows separation of the two devices such that each device may be used independently of the other device.

As the Examiner acknowledged during the telephone conference of July 27, 2004, the applied references (including Lenchik and Bodnar), either alone or in combination, cannot support a proper Section 102 or Section 103 rejection of pending independent claims 1, 18 and 24 as amended. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-17 depend from base claim 1, claims 19-23 depend from base claim 18, and claims 25-36 depend from base claim 24. Accordingly, the applied references (including Lenchik and Bodnar) cannot support a Section 102 or Section 103 rejection of dependent claims 2-17, 19-23, and 25-36 for at least the reason that these references cannot support a rejection of corresponding base claims 1, 18 and 24, and for the additional features of these dependent claims. Therefore, the rejections of dependent claims 2-17, 19-23, and 25-36 should be withdrawn.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**  
**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE – Art Unit 2682**

Attorney Docket No. 418268871US

E. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably define over the applied art. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes another telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call Steve Arnett at (206) 359-6351.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



Stephen E. Arnett

Registration No. 47,392

Date: Aug 20, 2004

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 25096  
Perkins Coie LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000